

PMNorthAnna3COLPEmails Resource

From: Jean-Claude Dehmel
Sent: Tuesday, August 26, 2008 3:50 PM
To: Jerry Hale; Andrea Johnson
Cc: Timothy Frye; Edward Roach; Stephen Williams
Subject: RE: ACTION: Requested Attendance at ESBWR DCWG Public Meeting on 9-4-08

Jerry..

I will not be able to attend the meeting of Sept 4, 08....out of the country.

Note that for NRC Letter 004 and 007, I have reviewed the Responses and responded - see below. Given the status of these RAIs, there is nothing of substance to discuss with the applicant.

I. Status of Dominion response to NRC RAI Letter No. 004 for RAI No. 11.02-1, 11.04-1A/B, & 11.05-1/2. See Dominion Letter NA3-08-051, dated June 30, 2008.

- a. RAI No. 11.02-1: As noted in an earlier e-mail, the status of RAI No. 11.02-1 was left opened pending the development of an evaluation tool. CHPB has now completed its evaluation of RAI No. 11.02-1 and finds the response acceptable. This RAI is closed and becomes a confirmatory item for the next revision of the COLA.
- b. RAI No. 11.04-1A: RAI closed, and now a confirmatory item.
- c. RAI No. 11.04-1B: This RAI addresses the adoption of NEI template for the PCP. NEI has submitted a final PCP template to the NRC, but closure of this RAI hinges on the staff issuing an SER on the final PCP template. The SER is in progress. Dominion has committed to update the text with the reference for the PCP template and SER. This RAI remains open as Dominion acknowledges this status.
- d. RAI No. 11.05-1: This RAI addresses the adoption of NEI template for the ODCM. NEI has not yet submitted a final ODCM template to the NRC, but closure of this RAI also hinges on the staff issuing an SER on the final ODCM template. The ODCM and SER are in progress. Dominion has committed to update the text with the reference for the ODCM template and SER. This RAI remains open as Dominion acknowledges this status.
- e. RAI No. 11.05-2: RAI closed, and now a confirmatory item.

II. Status of Dominion response to NRC RAI Letter No. 007 for RAI No. 09.03.02-1, 11.02-2, 11.03-0, 11.03-1, 11.04-2, 11.05-3, and 13.05.02.01-1. See Dominion Letter NA3-08-055R, dated July 23, 2008.

- a. RAI No. 09.03.02-1: This RAI is closed and becomes a confirmatory item for the next revision of the COLA.
- b. RAI No. 11.02-2: : This RAI is closed and becomes a confirmatory item for the next revision of the COLA.
- c. RAI No. 11.03-1: : This RAI is closed and becomes a confirmatory item for the next revision of the COLA.
- d. RAI No. 11.04-2: : This RAI is closed and becomes a confirmatory item for the next revision of the COLA.
- e. RAI No. 11.05-3: : This RAI is closed and becomes a confirmatory item for the next revision of the COLA.
- f. RAI No. 13.05.02.01-1: : This RAI is closed and becomes a confirmatory item for the next revision of the COLA.
- g. RAI No. 11.03-0: This RAI addresses the conduct of a plant and site-specific cost-benefit analyses for the GWMS, given that NRC/NEI jointly dropped the adoption of a generic CBA template earlier this year. While the staff's evaluation generally concurs with the CB ratios of the analyses of the three system augments considered, the review identified the following items as requiring further information and technical and regulatory clarifications. Specifically:
 - i) Given that the CB analyses are based on RG 1.110, provide reasons and rationale for not presenting the information (cost parameters) following the format of App. C to RG 1.110. See regulatory position C.5 of RG 1.110.

ii) The presentation of information and then discussions in excluding GWMS system design for PWR plants as being not applicable for BWRs is extraneous and should be removed from the proposed FSAR update, see FSAR p.11-7 and 11-8. The introduction of the CB analyses should state that all system augments considered in the analyses include only those that are compatible with BWR plant design features.

iii) The discussion and rationale for excluding the 600 ft³ gas decay tank, given a residence time of 19 minutes, is not consistent with the source term as there are noble gases with radioactive half-lives of less than 19 minutes. These include Kr-89, Xe-135m, Xe-137, and Xe-138, which make up a significant fraction of the noble gas source term for the turbine building. Accordingly, it is suggested that this augment be reconsidered on the basis of a CB analysis, rather than excluding it solely on the basis of radionuclide half-lives.

iv) The discussion supporting the exclusion of system augments on the basis capacity or flow rates is incomplete as it is not clear if attempts were made to match or approximate system capacities as closely as is possible with that of DCD system design features. For example, the consideration of a 15,000 CFM HEPA filtration system augment for the CONAVS system with a capacity of about 42,300 CFM is not logical. The closest option in RG 1.110 for such augment is 30,000 CFM, see table A-1. As a result, the discussion should provide qualitative and/or quantitative qualifiers addressing the impact of such differences in capacities and expected impacts (as direction and magnitude) of the resulting cost-benefit-ratio. This observation applies to all other CB cases dismissed in a similar manner in this response.

Note: For item g, the above issues were used in a supplemental RAI and uploaded in the eRAI workflow. This RAI has not yet been sent to the applicant as of last week.

-----Original Message-----

From: Jerry Hale

Sent: Tuesday, August 19, 2008 7:48 AM

To: Jean-Claude Dehmel; Andrzej Drozd

Subject: FW: ACTION: Requested Attendance at ESBWR DCWG Public Meeting on 9-4-08

Importance: High

Jean-Claude / Andrzej,

I understand each of you are acting this week for your respective Branch Chiefs, and therefore forward to you the following email.

JRH

-----Original Message-----

From: Jerry Hale

Sent: Tuesday, August 19, 2008 7:45 AM

To: Timothy Frye; Michael Snodderly; Peter Wilson; David Curtis

Cc: Andrea Johnson; Thomas Kevern; Jeffrey Cruz

Subject: ACTION: Requested Attendance at ESBWR DCWG Public Meeting on 9-4-08

Importance: High

The purpose of this email is to alert you regarding the ESBWR DCWG Public Meeting scheduled for September 4, 2008 (draft agenda attached).

Please note that at the request of the DCWG, the afternoon session will be devoted to technical discussion of the following RAI Letters. Appropriate representation from your Branch is requested:

Time	Topic	Branch
12:30-12:50 pm	RAI Letter #004	CHPB
12:50-1:10 pm	RAI Letter #007	CHPB
1:10-1:30 pm	RAI Letter #006	SBCV
1:30-1:40 pm	BREAK	

1:40-2:20 pm	RAI Letter #009	EEB
2:20-2:40 pm	RAI Letter #012	SBPB
2:40-3:00 pm	RAI Letter #017	SBPB

A listing of the questions for each RAI letter is attached (Excel file).

Please respond by close of business today with your commitment to support the meeting, including the members of your Branch who will be in attendance.

Negative responses are requested.

Jerry Hale
Project Manager
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Office of New Reactors
ESBWR/ABWR Branch 1
(301) 415-8148

Hearing Identifier: NorthAnna3_Public_EX
Email Number: 426

Mail Envelope Properties (01BD2A1885C88F45A12CB413DEF03410683B18F49D)

Subject: RE: ACTION: Requested Attendance at ESBWR DCWG Public Meeting on 9-4-08
Sent Date: 8/26/2008 3:50:05 PM
Received Date: 8/26/2008 3:50:06 PM
From: Jean-Claude Dehmel

Created By: Jean-Claude.Dehmel@nrc.gov

Recipients:

"Timothy Frye" <Timothy.Frye@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Edward Roach" <Edward.Roach@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Stephen Williams" <Stephen.Williams@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Jerry Hale" <Jerry.Hale@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Andrea Johnson" <Andrea.Johnson@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None

Post Office: HQCLSTR01.nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	7371	8/26/2008 3:50:06 PM

Options

Priority: Standard
Return Notification: No
Reply Requested: No
Sensitivity: Normal
Expiration Date:
Recipients Received: